

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-39, and 41-56. By this paper, Applicants have amended the specification and claims 13 and 45-51 to correct typographical errors and to make revisions suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner enter these amendments as they contain no substantive changes to the claims. Upon entry of these amendments, claims 1-6, 8-39, and 41-56 remain pending in the present patent application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 45-51 under U.S.C. § 101. However, claims 45-51 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 45-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and allow the claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claim 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. However, as suggested by the Examiner, Applicants have amended claim 51 to recite, *inter alia*, “wherein the feature of interest is substantially different in the first image as compared to the second image.” (Emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and allow the claim.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-56 under U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Carrott et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,909,792). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Anticipation under section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what

is claimed. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The present claims generally recite methods and systems for registering images with one another based on one or more anomalies or features of interest in the images. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner cited the Carrott reference for disclosing this registration. However, the cited passages do not discuss the registration of images based on anomalies. *See* Carrott, col. 3, lines 48-55 and col. 4, lines 4-32. Rather, a region of interest is scanned and two or more images are aligned. *See id.* Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to set out a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 9, 2008

/Floron C. Faries/
Floron C. Faries
Reg. No. 59,991
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545